arXiv:0808.2077v2 [quant-ph] 23 Aug 2008

Simple proof for the bounds of concurrence

Zhihao Ma,[1] Dong-Ling Deng,[2] Fu-Lin Zhang,[2] and Jing-Ling Chen[2,*]
[1]*Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, 200240, P.R.China*
[2]*Theoretical Physics Division, Chern Institute of Mathematics, Nankai University, Tianjin, 300071, P.R.China*

(Dated: August 23, 2008)

The bounds of concurrence in [F. Mintert and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140505 (2007)] and [C. Zhang *et. al.*, arXiv: 0806.2598] are proved by using two properties of the fidelity. This shows these two concepts in quantum information are closely related.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ta

Entanglement and fidelity are two important concepts in quantum information theory [1]. The former depicts the nonclassical connection between two parts of a quantum system. And the latter is a measure of *closeness* of two quantum states. They are shown to be closely related to each other in many aspects [2, 3, 4, 5].

One of the most famous measures of entanglement is the concurrence [3, 5] of two-qubit system, which is equivalent to the entanglement of formation [6]. The concurrence of a pure two-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$ is given by

$$C(|\psi\rangle) = \sqrt{2(1-\mathrm{Tr}{\rho^A}^2)} = \sqrt{2(1-\mathrm{Tr}{\rho^B}^2)}, \qquad (1)$$

where $\rho^A = \mathrm{Tr}_B|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is the partial trace of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ over subsystem B, and ρ^B has a similar meaning. For a mixed state, the concurrence is defined as the average concurrence of the pure states of the decomposition, minimized over all decompositions of $\rho = \sum_j p_j|\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$,

$$C(\rho) = \min \sum_j p_j C(|\psi_j\rangle). \qquad (2)$$

The decomposition making the convex combination reach the minimum is called an optimal one.

The fidelity [1, 7, 8, 9, 10] between two states ρ_1 and ρ_2 of a quantum system R reads

$$F(\rho_1,\rho_2) = \left[\mathrm{Tr}\left(\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho_1}\rho_2\sqrt{\rho_1}}\right)\right]^2. \qquad (3)$$

When $\rho_1 = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ and $\rho_2 = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$ are two pure states, $F(\rho_1,\rho_2) = \mathrm{Tr}(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|) = |\langle\phi|\varphi\rangle|^2$. Let Q is a copy of R, and $|\psi_1\rangle$ is a purification of ρ_1 and $|\psi_2\rangle$ of ρ_2 into RQ, then

$$F(\rho_1,\rho_2) \geq F(\sigma_1,\sigma_2) = |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|^2, \qquad (4)$$

where $\sigma_1 = |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|$, $\sigma_2 = |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|$, and $\mathrm{Tr}_Q\sigma_1 = \rho_1$, $\mathrm{Tr}_Q\sigma_2 = \rho_2$. It is proved in [11], that fidelity can be bounded above by the so called super-fidelity $G(\rho_1,\rho_2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} F(\rho_1,\rho_2) &\leq G(\rho_1,\rho_2) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1\rho_2 + \sqrt{(1-\mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2)(1-\mathrm{Tr}\rho_2^2)} \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned} \qquad (5)$$

When ρ_1 and ρ_2 are two pure states, $G(\rho_1,\rho_2) = \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1\rho_2 = F(\rho_1,\rho_2)$.

Very recently, Mintert and Buchleiner [12] proposed a scheme to observe the entanglement of ρ through a small number of projective measurement on a *twofold copy* $\rho\otimes\rho$. The key of their theoretic foundation is the lower bound of concurrence as

$$C^2(\rho) \geq 2\left[\mathrm{Tr}\rho^2 - \mathrm{Tr}{\rho^A}^2\right], \qquad (6)$$

where $C(\rho)$ is the concurrence for *arbitrary* states, taking the definitions in Eq. (2) and Eq. (1). Subsequently, Zhang *et. al.* [13] presented an observable upper bound of the concurrence

$$C^2(\rho) \leq 2\left[1 - \mathrm{Tr}{\rho^A}^2\right], \qquad (7)$$

which also provides a good estimation of entanglement in experiment [14] as done for the lower bound in Eq. (6). The two bounds are proved separately in [12, 13]. But we find these inequalities (6,7) can be distinctly understood in the viewpoint of fidelity. The details are as follows.

Suppose $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is an optimal decomposition of ρ, $\rho_i = |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$, and $\rho = \sum_i t_i\rho_i$, where $\sum_i t_i = 1$. The reduced density operator $\rho^A = \sum_i t_i\rho_i^A$, where $\rho_i^A = \mathrm{Tr}_B\rho_i$. It is straightforward to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C^2(\rho) &= 2\sum_{i,j} t_i t_j \sqrt{\left[1-\mathrm{Tr}{\rho_i^A}^2\right]\left[1-\mathrm{Tr}{\rho_j^A}^2\right]}, \\ \mathrm{Tr}\rho^2 &= \sum_{i,j} t_i t_j \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_i\rho_j), \\ \mathrm{Tr}{\rho^A}^2 &= \sum_{i,j} t_i t_j \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_i^A\rho_j^A). \end{aligned} \qquad (8)$$

Then, one can notice that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_i^A\rho_j^A) + \sqrt{\left[1-\mathrm{Tr}{\rho_i^A}^2\right]\left[1-\mathrm{Tr}{\rho_j^A}^2\right]} \\ &= G(\rho_i^A,\rho_j^A) \geq F(\rho_i^A,\rho_j^A). \end{aligned} \qquad (9)$$

On the other hand, ρ_i and ρ_j are two purifications of ρ_i^A and ρ_j^A, we obtain

$$1 \geq G(\rho_i^A,\rho_j^A) \geq F(\rho_i^A,\rho_j^A) \geq F(\rho_i,\rho_j) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_i\rho_j). \qquad (10)$$

---

[*] Email:chenjl@nankai.edu.cn

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}2 \geq C^2(\rho) + 2\mathrm{Tr}{\rho^A}^2 &= 2\sum_{i,j} t_i t_j G(\rho_i^A, \rho_j^A) \\ &\geq 2\sum_{i,j} t_i t_j \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_i \rho_j) = 2\mathrm{Tr}\rho^2 . (11)\end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof.

The above result shows that, the properties of the fidelity between two states in the optimal decomposition of a biparticle system lead to the upper and lower bounds of concurrence. The bounds happened to be the foundation to observe entanglement experimentally. This suggests the relation between entanglement and fidelity is profound and worthy of study further.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS This work is supported by the New teacher Foundation of Ministry of Education of P.R.China (Grant No. 20070248087). J.L.C is supported in part by NSF of China (Grant No. 10605013), and Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University, and the Project-sponsored by SRF for ROCS, SEM.

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[2] A. Uhlmann, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 032307 (2000).
[3] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997).
[4] J.-M. Cai, Z.-W. Zhou, and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Lett. A **363**, 392 (2007).
[5] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
[6] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54** (1996).
[7] D. Bures, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **135**, 199 (1969).
[8] Uhlmann, Rep. Math. Phys **9**, 273 (1976).
[9] Uhlmann, Rep. Math. Phys. **24**, 229 (1986).
[10] Uhlmann, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **46**, 63 (1989).
[11] J. A. Miszczak, Z. Puchała, P. Horodecki, A. Uhlmann, and K.Życzkowski, eprint arXiv: quant-ph/0702225.
[12] F. Mintert and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140505 (2007).
[13] C.-J. Zhang, Y.-X. Gong, Y.-S. Zhang, and G.-C. Guo, eprint arXiv: 0806.2598.
[14] X.-L. Niu, Y.-X. Gong, J. Li, L. Peng, C.-J. Zhang, Y.-S. Zhang, Y.-F. Huang, and G.-C. Guo, eprint arXiv: 0808.0776.